

DOCKS.

PORT OF AMOY.

SHIPOWNERS, AGENTS, AND COM. MANDERS are informed that the **DOCK COMPANIES** have been established at the above Port, and they are now open for business.

REPAIRING AND SPARRING VESSELS, OBTAINING AND PAINTING IRON SHIPS AND STEAMERS.

THEIR LARGE GRANTIE DOCK. Has 238 feet length on the blocks, and at average spring tide can receive vessels of 16 to 17 feet draught. It has a **CRANE** (LIFT) and **POWERFUL CENTRIFUGAL PUMP**.

And an **Engineer's workshop** fitted with Lathes and Tools, driven by steam. Iron and Brass Foundries, Boiler-makers' shop, large Smithy, and Carpenters and Boat-builders' sheds. All superintended by resident Europeans.

Their two smaller **GRANTIE DOCKS** can receive, at spring tide, vessels drawing 13 feet.

Spars, Timber, and other Dock-yard material kept in stock.

Quartermen for Officers, and a **DRY DOCK** for STORES, of vessels under repair.

FOUR DOCK.

RIVER MIN.

THE above granite floored DOCK, of the following dimensions: Length, 300 feet, Breadth at Bottom, 100 feet, is capable of receiving vessels drawing 13 to 15 feet, as the state of the tides will allow. The Dock runs dry to the blocks, and is equipped with a **CRANE** (LIFT) and **POWERFUL CENTRIFUGAL PUMP**.

The above premises comprise large Machine-Shop, containing a **WITWORTH'S 12-INCH SCREW CUTTING MACHINE**.

DRILLING AND SHAPING MACHINES.

A **LARGE SMITHY**, &c., &c., &c. Large Godowns on the premises for **STORAGE OF CARGO**, &c., &c., &c. Large Stock of Woods, Metals, &c., &c., &c. always on hand. The Dock Steam Tug, **Wonging**, is available at all times to tow vessels to or from Sea, at current rates, on application to **JOHN C. SKELLY**.

The list of Charges for lighting or unloading vessels can be obtained from **MESSRS. DE SILVA & CO., HONGKONG.**

THE VICTORIA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF HONGKONG, LIMITED.

CAPITAL \$1,000,000 IN 3,000 SHARES OF \$300 EACH.

PAID UP CAPITAL \$500,000.

Board of Directors:

W. R. FRANKS, Esq. (Messrs. Russell & Co.), Chairman.

D. S. SAMPSON, Esq. (Messrs. David Sampson, Sons & Co.).

J. F. BRYAN, Esq. (Messrs. Edouard Franchet, Sons & Co.).

HERMAN MELCHER, Esq. (Messrs. Melchior & Co.).

D. DEBONO, Esq. (Comptoir D'Escompte de Paris).

AVOUSTIN HEARD, Esq. (Messrs. Augustin Heald & Co.).

THE HONGKONG AND SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.

Head Office:

F. W. MITCHELL, Esq. (Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China).

Head Office:

HONG KONG.

Secretaries:

MESSRS. AUGUSTINE HEARD & CO.

THE COMPANY having been Registered under the Companies Ordinance, No. 1, of 1885, and is authorized to receive deposits, and to lend money, and to do all such other business as may be lawful for a company of the kind.

Twenty per centum of the profits of the Company will be distributed annually as a Bonus among contributing Shareholders, proportionately to the amount of premium paid by them.

AUGUSTINE HEARD & CO., Secretaries.

41, 390, Hongkong, 28th February, 1920.

THE CHINA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

REGISTERED UNDER THE COMPANIES' ORDINANCE, No. 1, OF 1885.

Directors:

The Hon. H. B. GIBB, Esq. (Messrs. Gibb, Livingston & Co., (Chairman).

J. B. LAYTON, Esq. (Messrs. Smith, Archer & Co.).

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Esq. (Messrs. Oliphant & Co.).

A. M. G. HEATON, Esq. (Messrs. Douglas & Co.).

EDWARD ARTHUR, Esq. (The Chartered Mercantile Bank of India, London and China).

HEAD OFFICE AT HONGKONG.

Secretaries:

N. J. EDE, Esq.

THE CHARTERED MERCANTILE BANK OF INDIA, LONDON, AND CHINA.

Agents:

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

Amoy, Messrs. BAKER & CO.

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1920.

NOW READY.

THE Chronicle for 1920 is now ready for delivery. It is a complete and up-to-date directory of the business and professional community of Hong Kong, and is a valuable reference work for all who are connected with the Colony.

It is already announced that the Directory is published in two parts. The first part, which contains the names and addresses of the business and professional community, is now ready for delivery. The second part, which contains the names and addresses of the residents of the Colony, is also now ready for delivery.

Copies may be obtained at the **Daily Press** Office, and at the following Agents: **Messrs. DUNN & CO., SWATOW.**

Messrs. WATSON, NICHOLLS & CO., AMOY.

Messrs. HING & CO., HONGKONG.

The delivery of the **Daily Press** from this office commences on Wednesday morning at 10.30, and the last issue is sent to the press at 10.45.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, July 28th, 1920.

"What course will France adopt?" is the question eagerly asked in all directions with reference to the Tientsin massacre.

The Admiral left Japan on the 9th, and by latest accounts, the forces were concentrating in the North, while in the meantime it was possible for the French Minister at Peking to have received telegraphic instructions from Paris.

If left to herself by the other powers, there can be very little doubt that the action of France would be of the most decisive character. But it is not to be supposed that the Chinese Authorities will be idle at such a time, and they are reported to be using their utmost endeavours to induce England and America to interfere in the matter, so as to avert the just retribution of the outrage of which they are guilty.

It is certain, will, as is her custom, not independently; and the quiet assertion of another portion of the Chinese Empire will, in all probability, be the compensation that she will expect.

To France, her language will be "You are free to do the same, but by yourself and on your responsibility without aid from us," while to the advocates of the Chinese cause—the mercenaries who are endeavouring to shield Cui Hsiang How, and the Chinese directly involved trying to make a case for their clients even out of the Tientsin massacre—her language will be terse but conclusive: "Come and take it back if you can." Will France yield to the pressure of her colleagues, supposing that the Chinese are able to induce them to use their efforts towards restraining her? It is scarcely to be hoped now. If such terms as those which have been suggested—the payment of some millions of dollars, and the occupation by France of Tientsin and Taku for the space of four years—be accepted, France will lose all her prestige in China, and must expect "a long and arduous" heavy contributions will be levied on the Chinese people, whose rage will be kindled against foreigners, and specially against France, when they are told that it is the Europeans who are burdening them with taxation. Their exasperation against foreigners will be thus aggravated, and the Mandarins will laugh in their sleeves as they foresee another outbreak.

It is not money that France wants of China. What she requires is respect of her rights—liberty and safety for her subjects in the country. And she must seek to repair the wrong that has been done to her in such a way as will permanently secure these ends. She has been wantonly and cruelly treated, and she has the right to demand full and permanent compensation. No other nation has ever been so grievously outraged in China. The blow was struck directly at her, and at her allies. France, therefore, has the right, if she sees fit, to act by herself. The comparison which has been drawn by France would be justified in acting on her own responsibility. "Remuneration of a debt" has been paid in Tientsin for days before the outbreak, but yet no offer of aid in a moment of danger was made to her. At all events, no such offer is recorded. It is possible that Mr. Poincaré did not request it, but it would seem at least right on the part of the other powers to have offered to cooperate with a view to avert the impending catastrophe. This letter to the North China Daily News from Mr. Meadows, Consul for the United States and other nations, reveals his strong leaning towards the Chinese even in this unfortunate matter, and it should prove true, as it is reported, that twice last year there was a disagreement between the official and the French Consul, the latter will certainly wear a somewhat serious aspect. It is beyond dispute that the Chinese are not aware of the unfortunate differences which always exist between the various foreign Ministers at Peking, they would never have ventured on such an attempt as the massacre of Tientsin. That massacre was the logical result of the absence of co-operation amongst foreign nations in China.

Another strong reason why France should adopt severe steps is that she has great influence here, as in other parts of the East, from her being the recognised protector of the Catholic religion. If the Catholic Missionaries in China are to see their colleagues and the Sisters of Mercy murdered in consequence of their being under the French protection, and no steps taken for their future security, they will prefer to give up the protection offered, as they cannot be more than murdered without it. Every-thing, in fact, shows that France is called upon to act with decision and severity. Never has she had so good cause to dictate advantageous conditions, and if she is left alone to perform the work which clearly devolves upon her, there can be little doubt that she will do it in a way that will redound not only to her own advantage, but to that of all the foreign nations which have interest in this country. On the other hand, if, through a mistaken view of the present political situation, other foreign nations are so ill-advised as not only to withhold their co-operation, but to restrain France from acting the punishment due, there can be no question that the Tientsin massacre will be but the prelude to further outrages, in which other foreigners will, in all likelihood, be the sufferers.

The question whether the names of informers with regard to criminals in Hongkong should be brought forward is one of so much importance that it is desirable as far as possible to set forth the full merits not only of the point which arose in the course of the trial of the three prisoners in connection with the recent purges on Friday last, but also of the subject generally. We purpose, therefore, to discuss the matter both on its legal and its general aspects, and to point out what appears upon careful investigation, to be its true bearings.

The columns of a newspaper are not a convenient place for a legal discussion, and it may seem presumptuous on the part of any but professional men, to express opinions upon questions of law. It is, therefore, right to state that having been taken to ascertain the bearings of this portion of the subject from a thoroughly reliable source, and we purpose briefly stating the law as it has been explained, and then discussing its effects, first, upon the particular case which has called forth these comments; and, secondly, upon the general question involved in the decision given by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The law at home on the subject appears to be, briefly, that as a general rule, communications from informers to the police are privileged. If there is not any clear necessity for the "evidence" in the case, it rests with the judge to use his discretion as to whether it should be brought forward. But in Hongkong, this discretion has to be guided by a due consideration of the local circumstances affecting the point, the Law of England being in force in this Colony under the exception of cases, (Ordinance VI. of 1945, Section 4), "where the name shall be inapplicable to the local circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants." The importance of this last point is that it removes the judge in Hongkong from being bound by a decision upon a point such as the one in question: "the circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants" differ from the circumstances existing at home.

There are thus two ways in which the question may arise—first, where the evidence of the informant is clearly part of the case; and secondly, where it is not so. In the former case, the judge at home has no discretion, and must admit the evidence; but here, even in such a case as this, if the peculiar circumstances of this colony make the judge sensible that it would be wrong to produce the witness, he may fall back upon the general rule, that information given to the police is privileged, and refuse to have the informer called; in which case, however, he is of course called upon to point out to the jury any defect in the evidence which may result from the absence of such testimony.

In the second case, namely, where the evidence of the informant is not clearly part of the case, the matter is entirely in his discretion even at home, and with the saving clause as to the application of the laws to this Colony, a fortiori here.

In the instance under notice, there does not appear to have been any reason to conclude that the informant's evidence was part of the case. The judge took upon himself, in the Attorney-General's absence, voluntarily to lead up to the question: who had given a privileged communication; and the female prisoner, before the name was given out, seized the opportunity of dragging forth the informant, by stating that she believed he had placed the stolen goods in her boat. She did not ask for an individual man, but simply for "the informant." If she had said she believed that A, B, or C, had placed the things in the boat, it might have been necessary to produce A, B, or C, even if he were the informant; but such was not the fact; and consequently the instance was not one where the informant's evidence was clearly part of the case. It thus seems that, even at home, the judge would not have been bound to allow the witness to be produced; and much less so here, where he has discretionary powers to decide how far the law is applicable to the circumstances of the Colony.

This, as we are given to understand is a fair statement of the law on the subject, and the systematic intimidation which is put in force in this Colony is borne in mind, it cannot be considered that the CHIEF JUSTICE acted wisely in insisting upon the production of the informant. The matter was clearly within his discretion, and he was not only entitled but called upon to take into consideration the special circumstances in this Colony, where it is certain that no informant as to criminals will be obtainable, if the informers have to run the risk of being brought forward. Justice has to be done to Society as well as to criminals. While it is the duty of a Judge to point out every consideration which may weaken a case against a prisoner—the absence of an informant's testimony as well as other things, if it really affects the case—he is bound also to consider the general interests of justice, and is certainly not called upon to lead a line of questioning up towards the production of witnesses, who are privileged from being brought forward, by the general policy of the Law as applied at home, and who ought more especially to be protected, in virtue of the discretionary clause as to the application of the Laws in this Colony, where the considerations, which entitle them to privilege at home, are of tenfold weight. There is no doubt that our system of legal proceedings offers large facilities for escape to a set of people, who are such great adepts in evasion and chicanery as the Chinese; and its administration ought to be such that, where it is possible, the loop holes for escape which are now considered by many thoughtful men as too large even at home, should be narrowed, not widened.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the ruling of the CHIEF JUSTICE in the case under notice will be reconsidered and an authoritative expression of opinion from home be, if necessary, obtained as to whether the rule laid down should or should not be applied under the Law as it stands. If such prove to be the case, there cannot, as already maintained, be two opinions upon the absolute necessity of some amendment being made in this law. To any right thinking man, it is certainly a very revolting that two innocent Chinese should have been murdered in a British Harbour, for the sake of a few paltry things, altogether worth probably not more than twenty dollars; and that prisoners, against whom the evidence at the preliminary investigations was very strong, should escape being tried for murder, in consequence of the informant's name having been given in court.

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1920.

NOW READY.

THE Chronicle for 1920 is now ready for delivery. It is a complete and up-to-date directory of the business and professional community of Hong Kong, and is a valuable reference work for all who are connected with the Colony.

It is already announced that the Directory is published in two parts. The first part, which contains the names and addresses of the business and professional community, is now ready for delivery. The second part, which contains the names and addresses of the residents of the Colony, is also now ready for delivery.

Copies may be obtained at the **Daily Press** Office, and at the following Agents: **Messrs. DUNN & CO., SWATOW.**

Messrs. WATSON, NICHOLLS & CO., AMOY.

Messrs. HING & CO., HONGKONG.

The delivery of the **Daily Press** from this office commences on Wednesday morning at 10.30, and the last issue is sent to the press at 10.45.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, July 28th, 1920.

"What course will France adopt?" is the question eagerly asked in all directions with reference to the Tientsin massacre.

The Admiral left Japan on the 9th, and by latest accounts, the forces were concentrating in the North, while in the meantime it was possible for the French Minister at Peking to have received telegraphic instructions from Paris.

If left to herself by the other powers, there can be very little doubt that the action of France would be of the most decisive character. But it is not to be supposed that the Chinese Authorities will be idle at such a time, and they are reported to be using their utmost endeavours to induce England and America to interfere in the matter, so as to avert the just retribution of the outrage of which they are guilty.

It is certain, will, as is her custom, not independently; and the quiet assertion of another portion of the Chinese Empire will, in all probability, be the compensation that she will expect.

To France, her language will be "You are free to do the same, but by yourself and on your responsibility without aid from us," while to the advocates of the Chinese cause—the mercenaries who are endeavouring to shield Cui Hsiang How, and the Chinese directly involved trying to make a case for their clients even out of the Tientsin massacre—her language will be terse but conclusive: "Come and take it back if you can." Will France yield to the pressure of her colleagues, supposing that the Chinese are able to induce them to use their efforts towards restraining her? It is scarcely to be hoped now. If such terms as those which have been suggested—the payment of some millions of dollars, and the occupation by France of Tientsin and Taku for the space of four years—be accepted, France will lose all her prestige in China, and must expect "a long and arduous" heavy contributions will be levied on the Chinese people, whose rage will be kindled against foreigners, and specially against France, when they are told that it is the Europeans who are burdening them with taxation. Their exasperation against foreigners will be thus aggravated, and the Mandarins will laugh in their sleeves as they foresee another outbreak.

It is not money that France wants of China. What she requires is respect of her rights—liberty and safety for her subjects in the country. And she must seek to repair the wrong that has been done to her in such a way as will permanently secure these ends. She has been wantonly and cruelly treated, and she has the right to demand full and permanent compensation. No other nation has ever been so grievously outraged in China. The blow was struck directly at her, and at her allies. France, therefore, has the right, if she sees fit, to act by herself. The comparison which has been drawn by France would be justified in acting on her own responsibility. "Remuneration of a debt" has been paid in Tientsin for days before the outbreak, but yet no offer of aid in a moment of danger was made to her. At all events, no such offer is recorded. It is possible that Mr. Poincaré did not request it, but it would seem at least right on the part of the other powers to have offered to cooperate with a view to avert the impending catastrophe. This letter to the North China Daily News from Mr. Meadows, Consul for the United States and other nations, reveals his strong leaning towards the Chinese even in this unfortunate matter, and it should prove true, as it is reported, that twice last year there was a disagreement between the official and the French Consul, the latter will certainly wear a somewhat serious aspect. It is beyond dispute that the Chinese are not aware of the unfortunate differences which always exist between the various foreign Ministers at Peking, they would never have ventured on such an attempt as the massacre of Tientsin. That massacre was the logical result of the absence of co-operation amongst foreign nations in China.

Another strong reason why France should adopt severe steps is that she has great influence here, as in other parts of the East, from her being the recognised protector of the Catholic religion. If the Catholic Missionaries in China are to see their colleagues and the Sisters of Mercy murdered in consequence of their being under the French protection, and no steps taken for their future security, they will prefer to give up the protection offered, as they cannot be more than murdered without it. Every-thing, in fact, shows that France is called upon to act with decision and severity. Never has she had so good cause to dictate advantageous conditions, and if she is left alone to perform the work which clearly devolves upon her, there can be little doubt that she will do it in a way that will redound not only to her own advantage, but to that of all the foreign nations which have interest in this country. On the other hand, if, through a mistaken view of the present political situation, other foreign nations are so ill-advised as not only to withhold their co-operation, but to restrain France from acting the punishment due, there can be no question that the Tientsin massacre will be but the prelude to further outrages, in which other foreigners will, in all likelihood, be the sufferers.

The question whether the names of informers with regard to criminals in Hongkong should be brought forward is one of so much importance that it is desirable as far as possible to set forth the full merits not only of the point which arose in the course of the trial of the three prisoners in connection with the recent purges on Friday last, but also of the subject generally. We purpose, therefore, to discuss the matter both on its legal and its general aspects, and to point out what appears upon careful investigation, to be its true bearings.

The columns of a newspaper are not a convenient place for a legal discussion, and it may seem presumptuous on the part of any but professional men, to express opinions upon questions of law. It is, therefore, right to state that having been taken to ascertain the bearings of this portion of the subject from a thoroughly reliable source, and we purpose briefly stating the law as it has been explained, and then discussing its effects, first, upon the particular case which has called forth these comments; and, secondly, upon the general question involved in the decision given by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The law at home on the subject appears to be, briefly, that as a general rule, communications from informers to the police are privileged. If there is not any clear necessity for the "evidence" in the case, it rests with the judge to use his discretion as to whether it should be brought forward. But in Hongkong, this discretion has to be guided by a due consideration of the local circumstances affecting the point, the Law of England being in force in this Colony under the exception of cases, (Ordinance VI. of 1945, Section 4), "where the name shall be inapplicable to the local circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants." The importance of this last point is that it removes the judge in Hongkong from being bound by a decision upon a point such as the one in question: "the circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants" differ from the circumstances existing at home.

There are thus two ways in which the question may arise—first, where the evidence of the informant is clearly part of the case; and secondly, where it is not so. In the former case, the judge at home has no discretion, and must admit the evidence; but here, even in such a case as this, if the peculiar circumstances of this colony make the judge sensible that it would be wrong to produce the witness, he may fall back upon the general rule, that information given to the police is privileged, and refuse to have the informer called; in which case, however, he is of course called upon to point out to the jury any defect in the evidence which may result from the absence of such testimony.

In the second case, namely, where the evidence of the informant is not clearly part of the case, the matter is entirely in his discretion even at home, and with the saving clause as to the application of the laws to this Colony, a fortiori here.

In the instance under notice, there does not appear to have been any reason to conclude that the informant's evidence was part of the case. The judge took upon himself, in the Attorney-General's absence, voluntarily to lead up to the question: who had given a privileged communication; and the female prisoner, before the name was given out, seized the opportunity of dragging forth the informant, by stating that she believed he had placed the stolen goods in her boat. She did not ask for an individual man, but simply for "the informant." If she had said she believed that A, B, or C, had placed the things in the boat, it might have been necessary to produce A, B, or C, even if he were the informant; but such was not the fact; and consequently the instance was not one where the informant's evidence was clearly part of the case. It thus seems that, even at home, the judge would not have been bound to allow the witness to be produced; and much less so here, where he has discretionary powers to decide how far the law is applicable to the circumstances of the Colony.

This, as we are given to understand is a fair statement of the law on the subject, and the systematic intimidation which is put in force in this Colony is borne in mind, it cannot be considered that the CHIEF JUSTICE acted wisely in insisting upon the production of the informant. The matter was clearly within his discretion, and he was not only entitled but called upon to take into consideration the special circumstances in this Colony, where it is certain that no informant as to criminals will be obtainable, if the informers have to run the risk of being brought forward. Justice has to be done to Society as well as to criminals. While it is the duty of a Judge to point out every consideration which may weaken a case against a prisoner—the absence of an informant's testimony as well as other things, if it really affects the case—he is bound also to consider the general interests of justice, and is certainly not called upon to lead a line of questioning up towards the production of witnesses, who are privileged from being brought forward, by the general policy of the Law as applied at home, and who ought more especially to be protected, in virtue of the discretionary clause as to the application of the Laws in this Colony, where the considerations, which entitle them to privilege at home, are of tenfold weight. There is no doubt that our system of legal proceedings offers large facilities for escape to a set of people, who are such great adepts in evasion and chicanery as the Chinese; and its administration ought to be such that, where it is possible, the loop holes for escape which are now considered by many thoughtful men as too large even at home, should be narrowed, not widened.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the ruling of the CHIEF JUSTICE in the case under notice will be reconsidered and an authoritative expression of opinion from home be, if necessary, obtained as to whether the rule laid down should or should not be applied under the Law as it stands. If such prove to be the case, there cannot, as already maintained, be two opinions upon the absolute necessity of some amendment being made in this law. To any right thinking man, it is certainly a very revolting that two innocent Chinese should have been murdered in a British Harbour, for the sake of a few paltry things, altogether worth probably not more than twenty dollars; and that prisoners, against whom the evidence at the preliminary investigations was very strong, should escape being tried for murder, in consequence of the informant's name having been given in court.

The question whether the names of informers with regard to criminals in Hongkong should be brought forward is one of so much importance that it is desirable as far as possible to set forth the full merits not only of the point which arose in the course of the trial of the three prisoners in connection with the recent purges on Friday last, but also of the subject generally. We purpose, therefore, to discuss the matter both on its legal and its general aspects, and to point out what appears upon careful investigation, to be its true bearings.

The columns of a newspaper are not a convenient place for a legal discussion, and it may seem presumptuous on the part of any but professional men, to express opinions upon questions of law. It is, therefore, right to state that having been taken to ascertain the bearings of this portion of the subject from a thoroughly reliable source, and we purpose briefly stating the law as it has been explained, and then discussing its effects, first, upon the particular case which has called forth these comments; and, secondly, upon the general question involved in the decision given by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The law at home on the subject appears to be, briefly, that as a general rule, communications from informers to the police are privileged. If there is not any clear necessity for the "evidence" in the case, it rests with the judge to use his discretion as to whether it should be brought forward. But in Hongkong, this discretion has to be guided by a due consideration of the local circumstances affecting the point, the Law of England being in force in this Colony under the exception of cases, (Ordinance VI. of 1945, Section 4), "where the name shall be inapplicable to the local circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants." The importance of this last point is that it removes the judge in Hongkong from being bound by a decision upon a point such as the one in question: "the circumstances of the Colony and its inhabitants" differ from the circumstances existing at home.

There are thus two ways in which the question may arise—first, where the evidence of the informant is clearly part of the case; and secondly, where it is not so. In the former case, the judge at home has no discretion, and must admit the evidence; but here, even in such a case as this, if the peculiar circumstances of this colony make the judge sensible that it would be wrong to produce the witness, he may fall back upon the general rule, that information given to the police is privileged, and refuse to have the informer called; in which case, however, he is of course called upon to point out to the jury any defect in the evidence which may result from the absence of such testimony.

In the second case, namely, where the evidence of the informant is not clearly part of the case, the matter is entirely in his discretion even at home, and with the saving clause as to the application of the laws to this Colony, a fortiori here.

In the instance under notice, there does not appear to have been any reason to conclude that the informant's evidence was part of the case. The judge took upon himself, in the Attorney-General's absence, voluntarily to lead up to the question: who had given a privileged communication; and the female prisoner, before the name was given out, seized the opportunity of dragging forth the informant, by stating that she believed he had placed the stolen goods in her boat. She did not ask for an individual man, but simply for "the informant." If she had said she believed that A, B, or C, had placed the things in the boat, it might have been necessary to produce A, B, or C, even if he were the informant; but such was not the fact; and consequently the instance was not one where the informant's evidence was clearly part of the case. It thus seems that, even at home, the judge would not have been bound to allow the witness to be produced; and much less so here, where he has discretionary powers to decide how far the law is applicable to the circumstances of the Colony.

This, as we are given to understand is a fair statement of the law on the subject, and the systematic intimidation which is put in force in this Colony is borne in mind, it cannot be considered that the CHIEF JUSTICE acted wisely in insisting upon the production of the informant. The matter was clearly within his discretion, and he was not only entitled but called upon to take into consideration the special circumstances in this Colony, where it is certain that no informant as to criminals will be obtainable, if the informers have to run the risk of being brought forward. Justice has to be done to Society as well as to criminals. While it is the duty of a Judge to point out every consideration which may weaken a case against a prisoner—the absence of an informant's testimony as well as other things, if it really affects the case—he is bound also to consider the general interests of justice, and is certainly not called upon to lead a line of questioning up towards the production of witnesses, who are privileged from being brought forward, by the general policy of the Law as applied at home, and who ought more especially to be protected, in virtue of the discretionary clause as to the application of the Laws in this Colony, where the considerations, which entitle them to privilege at home, are of tenfold weight. There is no doubt that our system of legal proceedings offers large facilities for escape to a set of people, who are such great adepts in evasion and chicanery as the Chinese; and its administration ought to be such that, where it is possible, the loop holes for escape which are now considered by many thoughtful men as too large even at home, should be narrowed, not widened.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the ruling of the CHIEF JUSTICE in the case under notice will be reconsidered and an authoritative expression of opinion from home be, if necessary, obtained as to whether the rule laid down should or should not be applied under the Law as it stands. If such prove to be the case, there cannot, as already maintained, be two opinions upon the absolute necessity of some amendment being made in this law. To any right thinking man, it is certainly a very revolting that two innocent Chinese should have been murdered in a British Harbour, for the sake of a few paltry things, altogether worth probably not more than twenty dollars; and that prisoners, against whom the evidence at the preliminary investigations was very strong, should escape being tried for murder, in consequence of the informant's name having been given in court.

The question whether the names of informers with regard to criminals in Hongkong should be brought forward is one of so much importance that it is desirable as far as possible to set forth the full merits not only

Business Announcements

[illegible]

Hyde Park Corner; with condensed accounts of
genius, government, history, &c., of the Celestial Em-
pire. By W. B. London. 8vo. cloth. London, 18

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873

TAUBNER & CO., CO., PATENTBRIEF NO.
